



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

HL

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/813,444	03/20/2001	Brent Iverson	MXGN:005USC2	3269
7590	09/10/2004		EXAMINER	
Steven L. Highlander, Esq. FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P. Suite 2400 600 Congress Avenue Austin, TX 78701			DO, PENSEE T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1641	
DATE MAILED: 09/10/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/813,444	Applicant(s) IVERSON ET AL.
Examiner Pensee T. Do	Art Unit 1641	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 October 2003.
2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) 1-45 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-37, drawn to a method of selecting a polypeptide, classified in class 435, subclass 68.1.
- II. Claims 38 & 39, drawn to a method of catalyzing a chemical reaction comprising obtaining a host cell and add sample, classified in class 435, subclass 326.
- III. Claims 40-42, drawn to a method of stimulating an immune response comprising administering to an animal a pharmaceutical composition, classified in class 435, subclass 7.1.
- IV. Claims 43-44, drawn to a purified or single-chain antibody, classified in class 530, subclass 387.1.
- V. Claim 45, drawn to a host cell, classified in class 435, subclass 325.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I & II; I & III; IV & V; II & V; III & V are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions of groups I and II are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions and different effects. Invention I and II have different modes of operations because the steps are different. Thus they would have different

effects because one is a method of selecting a peptide while the other is a method of catalyzing a chemical reaction, which involves adding a catalytic such as an enzyme. These methods are not capable of use together.

Inventions I and III also unrelated. For example, the method of group I is a method of selecting a polypeptide whereas the method of group III is a method of stimulating an immune response. Both methods have different effects and different modes of operations as well as different functions.

Inventions II and III are also unrelated. One is method of catalyzing a reaction while the other is a method stimulating an immune response comprising administering to an animal a pharmaceutical compound. These methods have different methods steps, different effects, and functions and are not disclosed as capable of use together.

Inventions I and IV are also unrelated because they are not disclosed as capable of use together. Invention I is a method of selecting a polypeptide from a plurality of candidates whereas invention IV is an antibody or a host cell that expresses the antibody. They are not capable of use together and have different effects.

Inventions IV and V are unrelated because a purified antibody and a host cell are not disclosed as capable of use together. These compositions also have different functions and effects.

Inventions II & V are unrelated because the method of catalyzing a reaction is not capable of use together with a host cell. Thus, they have different modes of operations, different effects, and functions.

Inventions III & V are unrelated. Invention III is a method of administering a pharmaceutical compound in an animal, which does not have requirement of the host cell of invention V. Thus, these have different modes of operations, different functions and effects.

Inventions IV and III are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case invention III can be used in a different process such as in an assay detecting digoxin.

Inventions IV and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the product of invention IV can be used in an assay detecting an antigen, which involves a step of detecting without adding a catalytic.

Inventions V & I are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of

using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the product of invention V, which is a host cell, can be used in a method of obtaining a vaccine.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group IV is not required for Group I, II, III or V, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

A telephone call was made to Mr. Steven Highlander on August 19, 2004 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pensee T. Do whose telephone number is 571-272-0819. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 7:00-3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Long Le can be reached on 571-272-0823. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Pensee T. Do
Patent Examiner
August 25, 2004

Christopher L. Chin
CHRISTOPHER L. CHIN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1800/1641
9/2/07